

VZCZCXYZ0010
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0180/01 0571445
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 261445Z FEB 08
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1125
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDOG/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000180

SIPDIS

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (ROBERTS)
NSC FOR SMITH
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)
SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC): WRAP UP FOR
WEEK ENDING FEBRUARY 22, 2008

REF: A) STATE 17328

This is CWC-09-08.

SUMMARY

11. (U) The week of February 18 saw quite a number of meetings and consultations, several of which were convening for the first time this year) Article X (February 18), the entire industry cluster followed by sampling and analysis and transfer discrepancies (February 19), the Host Country Committee (February 20), Article VII (February 20), and the Open Ended Working Group on Terrorism (February 21). Discussions are detailed below. The U.S. delegation also invited the Chinese delegation to a meeting to share views on the Review Conference; the productive discussion lasted more than two hours with a close convergence on key issues.

12. (U) The Open Ended Working Group for the Review Conference met February 21 but failed either to agree on the preliminary agenda or to allow the chairman,s draft agenda to be forwarded to the Executive Council. Informal meetings on the agenda followed, among the NAM and in an &informal informal8 meeting of interested delegations that Amb. Javits chaired on Friday afternoon and again on Monday morning. Meanwhile, Chairman Parker advised the group that due to the large number of comments on the draft report, the revised text would be distributed later in the week. The new draft appeared at 6:00 p.m. on Friday after many delegations had gone home for the weekend. Del expects that this will limit discussion of the report at the next OEWG on February 27.

13. (U) This cable also includes a scene setter for Executive Council 52 March 4) 7.

ARTICLE X CONSULTATIONS

14. (U) On February 18, facilitator Jitka Brodska (Czech Republic) chaired the first Article X consultations of 2008. Agenda items included: submissions on national protective programs, the concept of qualified experts, and a general discussion of readiness to provide assistance (designed by the facilitator to broaden what was otherwise destined to be a monologue by the Iranian delegation on its proposal to establish a network for the victims of chemical weapons). The consultation was well attended, with active participation from many delegations. TS expertise present included International Cooperation and Assistance (ICA) Director Amb. Mworio and Assistance and Protection Branch (APB) Head Gennadi Lutay.

15. (U) Under the first agenda item, the facilitator noted that the number of submissions on national protective programs actually dropped from 75 in 2006 to 63 in 2007, a troubling reversal of a trend of gradually increasing numbers over the past several years. Lutay expressed concern at this development and stressed that the TS is using every possible opportunity to encourage States Parties to submit this information. Brodska suggested that perhaps an email reminder directly to National Authorities, copied to delegations, might be helpful. Del Rep noted U.S. disappointment and recommended highlighting concerns in EC-52 and/or RevCon report language, a suggestion the facilitator took on board. In response to a U.S. query, APB staff assured delegations that national protective capacities (i.e. the existence or lack thereof of a program) are

always assessed prior to provision of further assistance.

16. (U) On the concept of qualified experts, the TS stated that 112 nominations were received and eighteen individuals finally selected as the core group of experts. Experts were selected from three fields: medical, chemical munitions/explosive ordnance disposal, and disaster management. The first round of training was held at the OPCW from 28 January to 1 February 2008. Information provided on the nature of the training itself was limited; the TS explained that some administrative issues are being worked out but that trainees signed a secrecy agreement and received medical clearance, and that the group visited Rijswijk, where equipment set aside for their use is stored separately.

17. (U) Experts are placed on SSA contracts, which have a maximum term of 24 months within a 36 month period. When the prospect of additional training (e.g. toxic chemical training similar to that undergone by inspectors, at a sum of c. 5,000 Euros per person) was raised, this led to an interesting discussion regarding the potential waste of resources training a temporary employee who would have to separate from the OPCW for at least a year following the first two years of the contract. The concept of temporary employment was, however, supported by NAM delegations who stressed the importance of regional representation in order to take advantage of training offered to the group which could, in turn, lend itself to building national and regional capacities. The TS explained that regional representation is taken into account to the extent possible, and that these experts can also participate in regional workshops, another way in which their expertise can contribute to capacity building.

18. (U) Under the third agenda item, the TS was first to take the floor to provide an update on its program of paying visits to SPs to inspect their Article X offers of assistance. In a welcome development from

past presentations and discussions, Lutay acknowledged that the TS needs to prioritize these visits, focusing first on offers of actual equipment as opposed to more general offers, such as training. Several SPs later reiterated the importance of differentiating qualitatively between offers of assistance so as to use TS resources most effectively. The TS also confirmed that whenever possible, these visits will be coupled with other training events or meetings, or be scheduled sequentially in a particular region. In general, the TS briefing and responses to questions took a

SIPDIS

slightly defensive tone, whereas delegations clearly wanted evidence of the utility of this practice, to include transparent reporting and a possible assessment after one year.

¶9. (U) Lutay also briefly mentioned the results of the TS participation in the TRIPLEX exercise last year, the scenario of which was a natural disaster that led to the release of toxic industrial chemicals. Germany pointed out that caution should be used to avoid straying from the basic mandate under Article X to provide assistance in the case of use or threat of use of chemical weapons, and not an industrial accident. Lutay acknowledged this and explained that, scenario aside, the response training was still valuable. In the context of such exercises, Del Rep noted that an update on TS readiness to provide assistance or to conduct an investigation of alleged use would be useful at the next meeting, as well as an outline of TS planned activities and/or areas of focus for the coming year.

¶10. (U) Iran then presented its proposal (circulated separately to delegations) for establishment of a network for the victims of chemical weapons attacks. The Iranian delegate recalled his country's own experience, and the fact that many doctors expressed regret that they had so little knowledge at the time of best practices for treatment (long and short term). He added that victims may not realize at the time that they have been exposed to chemical agent, and that the need for assistance is not confined to the exposure scenario alone, but could extend to long-term disabilities and follow-up medical and even psychological care. Iran acknowledged that the OPCW cannot provide for all of the possible needs of victims, but suggested that it might establish itself as a natural central point for the sharing of relevant expertise and information. Iran then proposed that the Secretariat assess the likely immediate, short-term and long-term needs of victims, and also who in the international community might be able to provide expertise and assistance.

¶11. (U) In an articulate and effective intervention, Italy noted that Iran itself has admitted that the Secretariat has no inherent competence in many of the areas envisioned in the proposal, and that Italy's view is that any action taken would be an expression of goodwill on the part of member states, and not/not fulfillment of any mandate under Article X. The Italian delegate used the topic of landmines as an example, noting that the support of victims in this and other areas has always fallen outside of the relevant treaty. He added that his understanding is that this is essentially an effort to "attract sympathies" and noted the substantial amount of work that remains to be done within the Organization's actual competencies. Switzerland and Germany supported this general assessment, with Germany adding its interpretation that paragraph 11 speaks to emergency assistance, which is by definition of an immediate nature.

¶12. (U) This led to an unfortunate digression by Iran into questions such as how we define "emergency" and "victim," when one ceases to be a victim, and how to distinguish between immediate and other needs. Iran agreed that some activities discussed are outside the mandate of the CWC, but reiterated that the Organization does have the mandate to assist the victims of CW attacks, and its view that the proposal is in line with the mandate of the Article X consultations. Iran then recommended that the OPCW coordinate efforts and create a mechanism for the exchange of information on assistance to CW victims, adding that the OPCW could "take credit" with minimal effort. The discussions concluded with a reference by Lutay to the fact that medical assistance or equipment has been offered by a number of SPs under Article X, and the facilitator's suggestion that the TS might provide a general assessment and legal

SIPDIS
opinion regarding further work.

¶13. (SBU) Del comment: Iran continues to demonstrate a good sense for tactics, although it may have overplayed its hand by referring too quickly to long term treatment. The idea that the Organization has some inherent expertise in the treatment of chemical casualties is valid, and the Iranians were careful to cast the entire proposal as forward-looking. (Had they not done so, the proposal might be more easily discredited as transparently self-serving.) The overarching concept of providing assistance to the victims is a positive one, and the Del's initial read is that Iran will be able to keep the proposal on the table by tacking around this core concept while seeing how far the limits of goodwill can be pushed. The more immediate concern is that Article X consultations not become little more than a forum for lengthy Iranian interventions on this topic, a good

reason to continue to provide concrete recommendations for other topics future consultations can explore. End comment.

¶14. (U) Under Any Other Business, the facilitator recommended the recently issued report on implementation of Article X in 2007 be discussed in the next meeting, which would necessitate deferral from EC-52 to EC-53, as the next meeting will be scheduled some time between EC-52 and the RevCon. In addition to the U.S. request for information on TS readiness and training plans, the Netherlands recommended more information also be provided on the Voluntary Fund in advance of the next consultations. Brodska also announced that she would be stepping down as facilitator this summer.

INDUSTRY CLUSTER) GENERAL

¶15. (U) On February 19, Amb. Dani (Algeria, Vice-Chair for the Industry Cluster) held a general consultation regarding the work of the Cluster and its future.

¶16. (U) The DG took the floor first, giving some issues that might be looked into in the near future: continued monitoring of progress made under the EC-51 decision on late declarations (Note: he mentioned that two SPs have submitted their declarations since the decision was taken); low concentration of Schedule 2A/2A* chemicals; OCPF site selection; risk assessment and inspection frequency; and improvements in the handling of industry declarations (e.g., the VIS project, expanding the information in OCPF declarations). He later pointed to OCPF site

selection as an issue of highest priority; he noted the need to give the current TS efforts time for evaluation, but said that results to date have been very positive.

¶17. (SBU) Del comment: The DG mentioned in his intervention the TS paper regarding OCPF declarations. Bill Kane (IVB) had previously told Delrep privately what the paper would contain generally and that TS staff would give the document to the DG by the end of January. The expectation was that the document would then be released generally fairly quickly, so as to be further discussed in advance of the Review Conference. In his intervention, the DG said that this paper would not be released until summer, well after the Review Conference. Del is not aware of the reasons behind this change but will try to discretely find out why. End comment.

¶18. (U) A number of delegations took the floor, pointing to those issues they consider to be of highest priority. Those topics that were mentioned included: risk assessment and inspection frequency; low concentration of Schedule 2A/2A* chemicals; OCPF site selection (focusing on element (c)) SP proposals); OCPF declaration improvements; evaluation of sampling and analysis as a tool for industry verification; continued monitoring of progress made under the EC-51 decision on late declarations (with both Germany and the Netherlands calling for further consideration of "nil" declarations); and transfer discrepancies.

¶19. (U) Iran asked the TS to provide a paper that would give more details about the approximately 18 issues that are shown as outstanding at this time. The DG agreed to this request and said it would take just a few weeks to prepare. The UK pointed to these issues as areas industry depends on to strengthen their image to the public, while cautioning that this

list will likely expand at the Review Conference. Australia noted that a recent meeting of IUPAC mentioned the increasing relevance of OCPF facility development to the CWC.

¶20. (U) Amb. Dani closed the meeting with a general call for facilitators to take on as many of the topics mentioned as possible. He also asked that delegations continue to prioritize their work on these matters.

SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS

¶21. (U) On February 19, Bill Kane (IVB) chaired a closed meeting of those countries who have hosted Schedule 2 inspections involving sampling and analysis to date. The countries who were in attendance were Korea, Italy, France, India, Germany, Japan, China, the Netherlands, the UK, Australia (which was finalizing its inspection as the meeting was being held), Switzerland, and the U.S. Kane said that the TS plans to carry out one more such inspection in March to close out the "trial period." However, the DG has requested the staff to prepare a report on this period and present it to him by the end of February. Kane also mentioned briefly some areas they have identified to date as needing further work to ensure smooth operations in the future: realization that logistical issues create the biggest disruption to operations; the need to plan for equipment reliability issues (including the carrying of spares); the need to continually add to the analytical database (i.e., OCAD); and the TS perception of the benefits of working in the "open

mode"; and the ability to provide technical explanations for the presence of low-level impurities.

¶22. (U) The discussion then went around the room to allow each delegation to share something about its experience. Delegations were generally positive about the experience, pointing to the work they did with the TS in advance as the reason for general success (although several delegations still found confusion with the TS during the inspection). Several delegations, however, noted their concern that smaller plant sites (which Schedule 2 sites tend to be) will generally not be able to lend the level of support (nor bear the cost) that these generally larger sites did during the trial period. Many called for a general rationale or criteria for how, when, why, etc. these tools would be used at future Schedule 2 inspections, as more general application seems unfeasible. Several delegations called for a process of evaluating the relative cost of using these tools against the verification benefit achieved. Some delegations called for a careful evaluation of the trial period and future Schedule 2 inspections before considering application of these tools during Schedule 3 or OCPF inspections. A large number of the SPs noted that their "on-site" laboratory space was actually at a location sometimes at considerable distance (as much as two hours) from the plant site. Similarly, many delegations noted that they designated a temporary point-of-entry just for this inspection to allow easier processing and inspection of the additional equipment.

¶23. (U) More specifically, France suggested that the use of an auto-injector would improve the analytical process. Germany made a very detailed presentation about their experience (faxed to ISN and Commerce) which touched on: additional burden, conceptual doubts, technical problems, questionable verification benefit, and results. (Del comment: This discussion also highlighted a number of

technical issues that were unique amongst the group to the German experience but which, as they are resolved, should serve to be very educational to other delegations.)

¶24. (U) Japan also pointed out that their industry is greatly concerned with the unwanted rumors these types of activities create and their potential damage to company reputations. India and China both noted that transportation issues could be a significant hurdle in their countries during future inspections. The Netherlands noted that their National Authority was asked to procure solvents and carrier gases for the inspection team, and then the inspection arrived with its own supplies. The UK, in its self-appointed role as the champion for sampling and analysis, noted for the group that it is not the role of SPs to approve the use of these tools and that British industry supports the general use of these tools, including their expansion to Schedule 3 and OCPF. Australia echoed these thoughts. Although pragmatic about the application, Switzerland stated their view that the TS is limited in what it can say about a plant site without the use of these tools. Switzerland also pointed out that their inspected site had been inspected five times before under various regimes and, thus, emphasized the need for applying logic to the selection of sites for these types of inspections. Switzerland also called on the TS to find ways to be more self-sufficient.

SIPDIS

¶25. (U) During the open discussion, France asked if there were any plan or option of considering

quantitative analysis in addition to qualitative. The TS pointed to the rough quantitative evaluation possible with the current methods (if needed to deal with an ambiguity) but did not indicate any plan to move beyond that. As questions arose, Kane explained that the stock presentation the inspection team gave at most sites was introduced after the third or fourth inspection because sites had mentioned that some sort of primer by the inspection team might be useful.

INDUSTRY CLUSTER) TRANSFER DISCREPANCIES

¶26. (U) The new co-facilitator for this matter, Rebekka Wulliman (Swiss National Authority), chaired a consultation on February 19. The focus of the meeting was to present the Co-Facilitators' Note and Draft Decision (both dated 1 February 2008 and are on the OPCW external server). After a brief introduction of these new materials, the floor was opened for comments.

¶27. (U) The Netherlands, U.S., UK, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland all spoke favorably of the draft decision. Some offered minor editorial suggestions, while some specifically asked that the decision (OP-5) include a deadline for implementation so as to give the TS a vehicle to start assessing the effectiveness of the revised guidelines.

¶28. (U) The Indian and Iranian delegations both stated they were awaiting instructions, although they were generally positive.

MEETING OF THE HOST COUNTRY COMMITTEE

¶29. (U) The Host Country Committee meeting February 20 was dominated by discussion on delegates' access to the OPCW commissary. Amb. Romeo Arguelles (Philippines) opened the meeting by stating that there appears to be two different ways to address

commissary access for delegates: finalizing a formal agreement with the Government of the Netherlands, or simply implementing administrative measures.

¶30. (U) Amb. Javits noted that entering into a formal agreement would provide clear guidelines and procedures. Referring to a draft agreement put forward by the Dutch Government in September 2007, he asked for some points to be clarified and others to be changed. There was general agreement on insuring access to the commissary for delegates -- without diminishing any existing rights and privileges -- and having clear procedures in place. Amb. Dominik Alder (Switzerland) briefly shared details on the commissary in Geneva, which is open to staff and delegates from all international organizations there. Amb. Maarten Lak (Netherlands) was present and promised to communicate the views of the Committee to the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

¶31. (U) The Committee will have an informational meeting on 19 March with officials from the Municipality of The Hague. Members will send suggested items for the agenda.

ARTICLE VII

¶32. (U) Facilitator Kimmo Laukkanen (Finland) chaired a meeting on February 20 and announced that this was likely his last formal meeting as facilitator. He

plans to continue through the March Executive Council and make his report there, but he will leave The Hague in the summer.

¶33. (U) Legal Advisor Onate (LAO) made his usual report on progress that has been achieved, this time since the decision of CSP-12 in November. Some of the highlights were:

- The total number of States Parties (SPs) has increased to 183 with the addition of Congo this month.
- 176 SPs have National Authorities (NA).
- 125 SPs have made an Article VII submission.
- 80 SPs have reported the enactment of comprehensive legislation.
- On November 29, the Legal Office sent out notes verbale regarding the CSP-12 decision. Since that time, one SP (Central African Republic) has designated their NA; two SPs have informed the TS of the enactment of legislation (Cook Islands and Qatar); six SPs have submitted to the TS the text of their implementation legislation (which LAO is now reviewing), administrative regulations, and adoption measures; and 35 SPs have informed the TS of the steps they have taken to date.
- Five other SPs have asked LAO for assistance in reviewing existing legislation with an eye toward recommendations on what else needs to be done.

¶34. (U) Turkey followed this presentation by announcing that its government had adopted implementing legislation and corresponding regulations on December 19, 2007. A notification to the TS will follow soon.

¶35. (U) India and Iran raised a series of questions about the presentation, basically trying to put as positive as spin on the progress made as possible. Given that these two countries have been vocal in the past about their desire to mark the Article VII progress made to date and move on to focus on other matters (e.g., Article XI), it seemed fairly transparent that this effort was made to set the stage for the discussion on this subject at the Review Conference.

¶36. (U) Del rep deployed the guidance provided and also cautioned delegations that any effort to marginalize the focus on Article VII will result in marginalizing discussions on other areas in which

legislation and administrative measures are fundamental) for example, declarations and verification, transfer of Schedule 3 chemicals to States not Party to the CWC, and Article XI.

¶37. (U) Amb. Mworio (ICA) made a detailed presentation on the outreach efforts of her group in Article VII assistance to SPs. These efforts include: technical assistance visits, bilateral visits with delegations in Brussels and London, National Authority meetings, parliamentary meetings, thematic workshops, and training sessions. (An electronic copy of this presentation was e-mailed to ISN and Commerce). These efforts are being funded through the general funds, as well as voluntary contributions by the European Union, Japan, and Korea. The Dutch delegation encouraged continued work to combine efforts and look for other efficiencies.

MEETING WITH CHINESE DELEGATION

¶38. (U) As part of our series of pre-RevCon bilateral

meetings with key delegations, Amb. Javits and Del reps met with Chinese Ambassador Xue Hanqin and three members of the Chinese delegation on February 20. Amb. Xue announced that she will be departing just before the RevCon for a posting back in Beijing. She also speculated that Cheng Jingye, the new Director-General for Arms Control in the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, might head the Chinese RevCon delegation. Amb. Xue suggested arranging a bilateral meeting with Mr. Cheng on the sidelines of the RevCon.

139. (U) The Chinese del asked about the provisional agenda. Amb. Javits stressed the need for a balanced agenda that would allow discussion of all states, issues. Amb. Xue responded that China has no difficulty with the agenda as it stands and is flexible with regard to inclusion and phrasing of particular points, specifically terrorism. At Amb. Javits' suggestion, Amb. Xue said that she could encourage the NAM to be flexible on the agenda. She commented that resolving the current impasse over the agenda should not be difficult but that it is important to look at the background motivators to discover the real points of contention.

140. (U) Turning to the Chairman's draft report text, Amb. Xue said that while dividing it into four blocks was procedurally convenient, they want to see "the forest as a whole" and are awaiting the complete version. Her deputy, Li Hong, noted that some NAM delegations feel there is a lack of transparency regarding inclusion of their comments and proposals. Amb. Xue said that some other ambassadors feel that things are out of control and that they are frustrated with the process. She once again suggested moving to a "rolling text" to keep track of all suggested edits, additions and deletions. Amb. Javits explained that a "rolling text" would be too unwieldy at this point in the process. Amb. Xue stated that China has one substantive concern regarding the final text: the Convention's objectives need to be maintained in a balanced manner. Specifically, the main task of the OPCW is destruction; everything else should be kept in balance.

141. (U) Speaking about Article XI, Amb. Xue said that some States Parties feel that they should be rewarded for their commitment to the Convention, noting that industry-related assistance is of little interest to them. Turning to OCPFs, she stated China's concern with the increasing number of inspections. While Chinese industry and local government positively view inspections as a form of external control and seal of approval, on a national level China has limited resources to support inspections. Both delegations agreed that the RevCon will only be able to have a general discussion of OCPF site selection and of sampling and analysis in the absence of the TS papers expected on these issues.

142. (U) Amb. Xue expressed her appreciation for Amb. Javits' remarks on U.S. destruction. She noted that it is too soon to look at shifting the OPCW's focus and that the priority of destruction (including of old and abandoned chemical weapons) needs to be reiterated. Amb. Xue also said that possessors should try to stick to their deadlines but agreed that it is too early to assess the situation or discuss how to react if they do not complete destruction in time.

143. (U) Briefly touching on challenge inspections, Amb. Xue and Amb. Javits agreed that they are a good tool and should be ready for use if needed. However, Amb. Xue suggested that full-scale exercises should

be used sparingly in order to not diminish the deterrent effect of challenge inspections.

OEWG: REVIEW CONFERENCE PREPARATION

¶44. (U) Discussion during the February 21 OEWG meeting focused primarily on procedure for forwarding the provisional agenda to the Executive Council. Of note were the increasingly polarized positions of the NAM and the EU, whose members supported one another with nearly identical talking points. Cuba, speaking on behalf of the NAM and China, stated that the rule of consensus had been violated as the draft provisional agenda forwarded for EC-52 consideration was not a consensus document. Slovenia, speaking on behalf of the EU, responded that many delegations had made compromises on the agenda in order to reach consensus and called on remaining delegations to do so, too. Slovenia specifically noted that there had been no substantive dissent in previous meetings to discussing science and technology, terrorism, or external relationships.

¶45. (U) Amb. Javits spoke in favor of keeping the agenda simple and suggested convening informal consultations with interested delegations to iron out differences. He went on to say that the agenda should not force discussion on any favored topic but should also be broad enough not to suppress or preclude discussion.

¶46. (U) After protracted debate, during which the meeting recessed to allow the NAM to caucus, Amb. Parker agreed to hold an informal OEWG on Tuesday (February 26) to discuss the substance of the agenda in hopes of reaching consensus on that before moving to discussion of the consolidated draft text on Wednesday (February 27). Supported by the TS, he made clear that, if no consensus is reached on the agenda, he is prepared to move forward with sending a chairman's draft to the EC for consideration.

¶47. (U) On February 22 and 25, Amb. Javits chaired &informal informal8 consultations with interested delegations (Algeria, Canada, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Guatemala, India, Iran, Italy, Mexico, Morocco, the Philippines, Russia, Saudi Arabia,

Slovenia, South Africa, and the U.S.). He urged delegations to pledge to one another that all states, issues would be discussed at the Review Conference, and that the agenda would not limit discussion in any way and stated that this informal group would take no decisions, but merely share views. He stressed that a simple agenda would cover everyone's issues better than specific textual additions of favorite items. The NAM had met at length before the first &interested party8 meeting and planned to meet again on Monday after the broader group. While the NAM agreed to drop &full implementation of Article XI,8 at issue are whether items on terrorism (on which the NAM is split), the OPCW's relationships with external bodies, and science and technology should be included. The U.S. (represented by del rep with Amb. Javits in the chair) continued to object to the disarmament clause added to &international peace and security8 (item 9a), urging simplification and noting that terrorism would naturally come under that item. Through both meetings, Amb. Javits reminded delegations that the agenda will disappear and that the final report and political declarations will be the living products of the RevCon. All delegations present generally agreed that the agenda should not suppress or preclude discussion of any relevant issues during the RevCon.

¶48. (U) On February 21, Annie Mari (France) chaired the first meeting of the Open Ended Working Group on Terrorism of 2008. The meeting focused primarily on a presentation by Amb. Dato Hussin Nayan, Director General of the South East Asia Center for Counter Terrorism (SEACCT) in Kuala Lumpur. The presentation was followed by some questions, and the expected implication from India and Iran that efforts against terrorism were outside the mandate of the OPCW.

¶49. (U) The Chair opened by reminding delegations of the utility of the OEWG as a forum for exchanging experiences, and the fact that the OEWG is in no way intended to indicate that the OPCW is an anti-terrorist organization. Mari recalled that previous meetings had involved speakers from UNICRI, the 1540 Committee, and the African Center for Study and Research on Terrorism in Algeria, and in that vein welcomed the presentation from South East Asia. Mari noted that the work of the group tapered off last year, as the Office of Special Projects (TS office with primary responsibility for this subject) was focused on Tenth Anniversary Activities. She expressed her intent to re-invigorate the consultations this year, focusing on three main areas: strengthening relations with other relevant organizations, building on the role that national implementation and assistance and protection play in preventing or mitigating the effects of terrorism, and establishing closer links with chemical industry.

¶50. Amb. Nayan provided an overview of the founding and funding of SEACCT, which was established in 2002 and is fully funded by the Government of Malaysia, endorsed by ASEAN. He emphasized that the vision of SEACCT is to become an effective counter-terrorism training and research center, not an operational counter-terrorism unit. The center's mission is based on four general goals: to develop and conduct training programs, to promote public awareness, to advise and assist the Government of Malaysia, and to network with similar institutions.

¶51. A number of details were provided on the size of the center's staff (45 personnel), past and planned training courses, and countries who partnered with

the center to provide training, including the U.S., U.K., Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Japan. Amb. Nayan noted that the closest ties to the OPCW existed in CBRNE specific training, and pointed to the implementation of the CWC as one of the topics covered in this training. He listed the following as possible areas of cooperation:

- the prevention, response to and investigation of chemical incidents;
- strengthening practices governing industry and professionals;
- emergency response (best practices, exercises, training for first responders); and
- investigation and prosecution.

¶52. The speaker concluded by noting that SEACCT and the OPCW do have opportunities for cooperation, and that the stability fostered by vigilance in counter-terrorism is key in creating an environment conducive to economic development. Delegations had relatively few questions, the most relevant of which came from the Algerian Ambassador, who asked for the speaker's assessment of the new threat of chemical terrorism and his expectation of the OPCW's role. Amb. Nayan stated that in his view the active threat of chemical terrorism is negligible, but that a real passive

threat exists in the lack of comprehensive industry regulations. He noted that the greatest resource the OPCW can provide is its expertise.

¶53. Iran and India both attempted to call into question the mandate of the OEWG and the OPCW's role in the fight against terrorism, with Iran going one step further with a clumsy attempt to turn the discussions toward its proposal for a "CW victims network." Del Rep, drawing on the Revcon Objectives Cable (Ref A), noted the U.S. view that the OPCW can contribute to the fight against terrorism in a number of ways that clearly fall within the scope of the CWC, and encouraged further work and the continued use of the OEWG as a useful forum for exchanging ideas on the increasingly relevant topic of chemical terrorism.

SCENESETTER FOR EC-52

¶54. (U) On destruction issues, Del expects deferral of documents and possible trouble on the report of the EC visit to Anniston. Following a meeting with the Russian delegation early in the EC week, Del expects the U.S. and Russia will agree to mutual deferral (preferably done from the EC Chair) of the facility agreements and verification plans for Maradykovsky, Leonidovka and Newport. On Newport, Del has already advised deferral due to changes necessitated by emergency destruction at Blue Grass; Del will script remarks for the EC Chair. The Pine Bluff Binary (PBBDF) documents have also remained on the agenda for consideration, despite the fact that PBBDF completed secondary treatment operations in December 2007. Del has noted this during the EC Chair's preparatory meeting February 25, and expects to request from the floor that these items be removed from the agenda.

¶55. (U) Del expects minimal comment on the third round of quarterly destruction updates submitted by the possessor states which requested extensions to their final destruction deadlines. However, the U.S. update, as well as the DG's semi-annual note on progress in meeting revised deadlines, have been the victim of Iranian posturing during previous sessions. It is more likely, though, that the Iranians will focus on finding fault with some aspect of the report of the EC visit to Anniston, one possible outcome of which would be an Iranian request to "receive" the

report instead of "noting" as indicated by the agenda.

¶56. (U) As noted above, the facilitator for Article X intends to request deferral of consideration of the report on implementation of Article X to the following EC, to allow for discussion in the next round of consultations. During the EC Chair's preparatory meeting, South Africa recommended similar steps be taken with the Article XI report; facilitator Li Hong (China) requested this be postponed until after this week's Article XI meeting (scheduled for February 29).

¶57. (SBU) Del comment: With the deferral of Newport, the removal of Pine Bluff Binary documents, the likely deferral of the Maradykovsky and Leonidovka documents, and the deferral of the Article X report and possibly the Article XI report, the agenda for EC-52 is rapidly losing substance. It is too soon, however, to predict a short EC, given the continued lack of consensus on a provisional agenda for the RevCon. It is also possible that deferral of Article X will only build a stronger Iranian case for immediate action on a "victims network" at the

RevCon. End comment.

[¶](#)58. (U) Javits sends.
Schofer